



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/576,340

04/18/2006

Siew Leong Kan

1138.P041US/ADR/jt

9688

38556

7590

08/13/2010

LAWRENCE Y.D. HO & ASSOCIATES PTE LTD
30 BIDEFORD ROAD, #02-02, THONGSIA BUILDING
SINGAPORE, 229922
SINGAPORE

EXAMINER

YOHANNES, TESFAY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2441

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/13/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/576,340	Applicant(s) KAN ET AL.	
	Examiner TESFAY YOHANNES	Art Unit 2441	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office Action is in responsive to the amendments and Applicant's response filed on 7/13/2010. Claims 1 and 6 are amended. Claims 2, 7, and 8 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3-6, and 9 are pending.

Drawings

2. The Examiner contends that the drawings submitted on 04/18/2006 are acceptable for examination proceedings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a

Art Unit: 2441

later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. **Claims 1, and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rappaport et al (US 20040229623 A1), hereinafter Rappaport, in view of Diener (US 7110756 B2), further in view of Brown (US 20030212588 A1), and furthermore in view of Zimmerman et al (US 20010012990 A1), hereinafter Zimmerman.**
6. Regarding claim 1, **Rappaport** discloses a wireless network simulation system for simulating wireless network performances for planning a wireless network having a predetermined layout (*a system is provided for allowing an system designer to dynamically model a wireless communication system for a building, campus, city or other environment electronically*) (**Rappaport, paragraph [0011]**).

a template database having a plurality of templates of wireless performance data (*database containing information relevant to the prediction of wireless communication system performance*) (**Rappaport, paragraph [0053]**).

Rappaport does not disclose said wireless performance data is obtained through site surveys of a variety of locations and sites.

In an analogous art **Diener** discloses wireless performance data is obtained through site surveys of a variety of locations and sites (*data collected by the sensors or client devices with location allows for a visual display of information relevant to the performance of a wireless network, such as an 802.11 WLAN*) (**Diener, column 13, lines 29-32**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings disclosed by **Diener** into the teachings of **Rappaport**.

One would have been motivated to do so in order to enhance telecommunications network planning and designing process.

Rappaport-Diener does not disclose template identifier that operable to access the template database that comprises simulation template database and test-bed template database, the template identifier is adapted to receive search terms and search through the simulation template data and the test-bed template databases for identifying matching templates from the template database based on said search terms, wherein the search term include design factors relating to wireless network and the predetermined layout.

In an analogous art **Brown** discloses template identifier that operable to access the template database that comprises simulation template database and test-bed template database (*the objects and links are stored in a database or other storage arrangement suitable for the specific embodiment*) (**Brown, paragraph [0046]**), the template identifier is adapted to receive search terms

Art Unit: 2441

and search through the simulation template data and the test-bed template databases for identifying matching templates from the template database based on said search terms, wherein the search term include design factors relating to wireless network and the predetermined layout (*receiving at a user computer a list of object templates from a host computer system, selecting an object template from a list of object templates*) (**Brown, paragraph [0008]**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings disclosed by **Brown** into the teachings of **Rappaport-Diener**.

One would have been motivated to do so in order to enhance and expedite telecommunications network planning and designing process.

Moreover, **Rappaport-Diener-Brown** does not disclose a wireless network performance contour overlay generator, that operable to receive desired performance parameters and process the matching template based on the design factors of the wireless network and create wireless network performance contour overlays from the desired performance parameters extracted from said matching templates and a wireless network performance contour overlay superimposer for receiving predetermined layout.

In an analogous art, **Zimmerman** discloses a wireless network performance contour overlay generator for creating network performance contour overlays from performance parameters extracted from said matching templates (*overlay of the IP protocol layer of the transmissions network of FIG.*

1 as generated by a conventional IP NMS application) (Zimmerman, paragraph [0013]) and a network performance contour overlay superimposer for receiving predetermined layout (mapping out an overlay including the network elements operative in the protocol layer) (Zimmerman, paragraph [0005]), and superimpose at least one of said wireless network performance contour overlays onto said predetermine layout producing a superimposed layout (overlays of two or more protocol layers of the model superimposed one on the other) (Zimmerman, claim 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings disclosed by **Zimmerman** into the teachings of **Rappaport-Diener-Brown**.

One would have been motivated to do so in order to enhance and expedite the communications network planning process.

7. Regarding claim 3, **Rappaport-Diener-Brown-Zimmerman** discloses a system in accordance with claim 2, wherein said plurality of templates comprises a plurality of test-bed templates and a plurality of simulation templates (*Every object can be classified into a discrete set of object types. Thus, some embodiments of the present invention include object templates to aid in the creation of new objects*) (**Brown, paragraph [0054]**).

8. Regarding claim 4, **Rappaport-Diener-Brown-Zimmerman** discloses a system in accordance with claim 1, further comprising a displaying means for displaying said superimposed layout (*displaying overlays of protocol layers on a Graphic User Interface (GUI), thereby enabling visual discrimination there between*) (**Zimmerman, paragraph [0020]**).
9. Regarding claim 5, **Rappaport-Diener-Brown-Zimmerman** discloses a system in accordance with claim 1 further comprising reproduction means for printing said superimposed layout onto some media means (*mapping out an overlay including the network elements operative in the protocol layer*) (**Zimmerman, paragraph [0005]**).
10. **Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rappaport et al (US 20040229623 A1), hereinafter Rappaport, in view of Brown (US 20030212588 A1), and further in view of Zimmerman et al (US 20010012990 A1), hereinafter Zimmerman.**
11. Regarding claim 6, **Rappaport** discloses a wireless network simulation system for simulating wireless network performances for planning a wireless network having a predetermined layout (*a system is provided for allowing an system designer to dynamically model a wireless communication system for a*

building, campus, city or other environment electronically) (Rappaport, paragraph [0011]).

receiving the predetermined layout and search terms, wherein the search terms include design factors relating to the predetermined layout *(the designer may use a mouse or other positioning device to point and click to any number of locations in the floor plan to select critical areas).*

accessing a template database having a plurality of templates of wireless performance data *(database containing information relevant to the prediction of wireless communication system performance) (Rappaport, paragraph [0053]).*

Rappaport does not disclose template identifier that operable to access the template database that comprises simulation template database and test-bed template database, the template identifier is adapted to receive search terms and search through the simulation template data and the test-bed template databases for identifying matching templates from the template database based on said search terms, wherein the search term include design factors relating to wireless network and the predetermined layout.

In an analogous art **Brown** discloses template identifier that operable to access the template database that comprises simulation template database and test-bed template database *(the objects and links are stored in a database or other storage arrangement suitable for the specific embodiment) (Brown, paragraph [0046])*, the template identifier is adapted to receive

search terms and search through the simulation template data and the test-bed template databases for identifying matching templates from the template database based on said search terms, wherein the search term include design factors relating to wireless network and the predetermined layout *(receiving at a user computer a list of object templates from a host computer system, selecting an object template from a list of object templates)* (**Brown, paragraph [0008]**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings disclosed by **Brown** into the teachings of **Rappaport**.

One would have been motivated to do so in order to enhance and expedite telecommunications network planning and designing process.

Moreover, **Rappaport-Brown** does not disclose a wireless network performance contour overlay generator, that operable to receive desired performance parameters and process the matching template based on the design factors of the wireless network and create wireless network performance contour overlays from the desired performance parameters extracted from said matching templates and a wireless network performance contour overlay superimposer for receiving predetermined layout.

In an analogous art, **Zimmerman** discloses a wireless network performance contour overlay generator for creating network performance contour overlays from performance parameters extracted from said matching

templates (*overlay of the IP protocol layer of the transmissions network of FIG. 1 as generated by a conventional IP NMS application*) (**Zimmerman, paragraph [0013]**) and a network performance contour overlay superimposer for receiving predetermined layout (*mapping out an overlay including the network elements operative in the protocol layer*) (**Zimmerman, paragraph [0005]**), and superimpose at least one of said wireless network performance contour overlays onto said predetermine layout producing a superimposed layout (*overlays of two or more protocol layers of the model superimposed one on the other*) (**Zimmerman, claim 3**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings disclosed by **Zimmerman** into the teachings of **Rappaport-Brown**.

One would have been motivated to do so in order to enhance and expedite the communications network planning process.

12. Regarding claim 9, **Rappaport-Brown-Zimmerman** discloses a method in accordance with claim 6, after step c. comprising step c: assigning a matching template if step c. produces no matching template (*selecting an object template from a list of object templates*) (**Brown, paragraph [0008]**).

Response to Arguments

13. Regarding the Applicant's argument that claims 1 and 6 are have included the limitations of the previously submitted claims 7 and 8 and therefore are in condition of allowance; moreover, since dependent claims 3-5, and 9 depend on independent claims 1 and 6, they should also be in condition of allowance; the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Simply combining previously rejected dependent claims to independent claims does not put a claim in condition of allowance. As they currently stand, claims 1 and 6 do are not in condition of allowance based on the prior art. Note rejection above.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2441

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TESHAY YOHANNES whose telephone number is (571)270-7528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 7:30-5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on (571) 272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. Y./ 8/5/2010

Examiner, Art Unit 2441

/Wing F. Chan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2441